

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application are respectfully requested.

The claims stand rejected over various combinations of prior art. In response, many of the claims are now amended herein.

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of Claim 31 therein, to recite that the titanium oxide is an additive to the polyethylene.

Claim 31 was rejected over PCT Publication No.: WO 02/25311 (hereinafter '311) in view of O'kane, SR. et al. This contention is respectfully traversed.

'311 teaches that the reflector part is made from epoxy resin treated with titanium oxide. See column 4 lines 12-14. The claims recite that the reflector is made from plastic, but nowhere does anything else in Freund et al. suggest that. The treating of epoxy resin with titanium oxide is entirely different than adding titanium oxide as an additive to a polyethylene material as claimed.

The secondary reference to O'kane, SR. et al. does show that polyethylene materials can be used in various applications. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that such a polyethylene material should be modified with titanium oxide to

make it reflective. Therefore, the hypothetical combination quite clearly fails with respect to Claim 1.

Claim 9 is amended to include the limitations of Claim 10 therein. Claim 10 was rejected over Freund et al. in view of O'kane, SR. et al. and further in view of DiFilippo. DiFilippo teaches the use of an air gap to form a better reflection. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in DiFilippo of forming the air gap using a protrusion that is part of the preformed reflector. The rejection itself indicates that DeFilippo's air gap is formed from adhesive material. This does not make obvious the reflector being formed with a protrusion, as defined by Claim 9, that allows an air gap. Hence, this should be further patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 16 was rejected over Freund et al. in view of Hoffman. The rejection states that Hoffman teaches that multiple different types of scintillator materials can be used. Hoffman does teach in general that different materials may be used for different purposes. However, the concept of using different materials would be wholly inconsistent with Freund et al.'s teaching of forming the materials as one unit such as in Freund et al.'s figure 4, and then grinding off a portion of the unit after. With all due respect, there is no teaching or suggestion of this in the hypothetical combination of prior art.

Claim 37 has been further amended to recite that the separated pixels of scintillator material define a two-dimensional array, for example as shown in figure 1a. Freund et al. shows only a one-dimensional array of separated pixels. In fact, Freund's figure 4 shows that one reason for this one-dimensional formation is so that the pixels can be moved relative to one another as shown in the figure. The movement and deformation shown in figure 4 would not be possible in a two-dimensional array. Accordingly, Claim 37 should be allowable for these reasons.

Claim 44 has been amended to emphasize that one of the inner surfaces of the reflector is used for forming the air gap. This is in no way taught or suggested by the cited prior art, and should be allowable thereover.

Each of the dependent claims should be allowable for reasons set forth above with respect to the respective independent claims.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed.

Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicants ask that all claims be allowed. Please apply the \$100 extra claim fee, and any credits or additional charges, to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 9, 2007

/Scott C Harris/
Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer No. 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
(858) 678-5070 telephone
(858) 678-5099 facsimile

10707201.doc